

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
FLORENCE DIVISION

|                            |   |  |
|----------------------------|---|--|
| United States of America,  | ) | CRIMINAL NO. 4:98-240-CMC                    |
|                            | ) |  |
| v.                         | ) | <b>AMENDED OPINION and ORDER<sup>1</sup></b> |
|                            | ) |  |
| James Harrison Singletary, | ) |  |
|                            | ) |  |
| Defendant.                 | ) |  |
| _____                      | ) |  |

This matter is before the court on Defendant's motion for relief pursuant to § 2255. The Government has moved to dismiss this matter. On March 28, 2011, Defendant responded to the Government's motion.

This motion is successive in nature. Defendant's failure to seek permission to file a second or successive motion in the appropriate court of appeals prior to the filing of the motion in the district court is fatal to the outcome of any action on the motion in this court. The Anti-Terrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act (AEDPA) of 1996, Pub. L. No. 104-132, 110 Stat. 1214 (1996), placed specific restrictions on second or successive motions under 28 U.S.C. § 2255. Prior to filing a second or successive motion under § 2255, Defendant must obtain certification by a panel of the Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals allowing him to file a second or successive motion. As provided in 28 U.S.C. § 2244, "[b]efore a second or successive application permitted by this section is filed in the district court, the applicant shall move in the appropriate court of appeals for an order authorizing the district court to consider the application." 28 U.S.C. § 2244(b)(3)(A). This he has not done.

The Government's motion to dismiss is granted and Defendant's motion is dismissed as this court is without jurisdiction to consider it.

---

<sup>1</sup>This Order is amended to reflect that Defendant filed a response to the Government's motion to dismiss and to provide a ruling on a certificate of appealability, as required by Rule 11(a) of the Rules Governing Section 2255 Proceedings for the United States District Courts.

**CERTIFICATE OF APPEALABILITY**

The governing law provides that:

(c)(2) A certificate of appealability may issue . . . only if the applicant has made a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right.

(c)(3) The certificate of appealability . . . shall indicate which specific issue or issues satisfy the showing required by paragraph (2).

28 U.S.C. § 2253(c). A prisoner satisfies this standard by demonstrating that reasonable jurists would find this court's assessment of his constitutional claims is debatable or wrong and that any dispositive procedural ruling by the district court is likewise debatable. *See Miller-El v. Cockrell*, 537 U.S. 322, 336 (2003); *Slack v. McDaniel*, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000); *Rose v. Lee*, 252 F.3d 676, 683 (4th Cir. 2001). In this case, the legal standard for the issuance of a certificate of appealability has not been met. Therefore, a certificate of appealability is **denied**.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

s/ Cameron McGowan Currie  
CAMERON MCGOWAN CURRIE  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Columbia, South Carolina  
May 12, 2011